

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to Response/Arguments filed on March 3, 2008. Claims 1-12 are amended. This application is a new PCT National Stage application of PCT/JP04/09923 that was filed on December 7, 2004. Applicant is claiming foreign priority for the application 2003-196076 filed on December 7, 2003 in Japan.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-24 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 13 are independent claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed March 3, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. See rejection details for Claims 1-24.

1) Regarding Abstract and Drawing Objection, the objections are withdrawn, because applicant amended the Abstract and Objection.

2) Regarding Specification objection, applicant acknowledges the objection. Examiner leaves the objection as a reminder.

3) Regarding Claim 12 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101, applicant amended the Claim and the rejection is withdrawn.

4) Regarding applicant's argument about the amended Claims, amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection. See rejection details.

5) Regarding applicant's argument about hindsight reasoning for Claim 1, in response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Information Disclosure Statement Acknowledgement

The information disclosure statements filed on March 12, 2008 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. It has been placed in the application file, the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Specification Objection

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3-6, 12, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being by Roisin, "Implementing the Cut-and-Paste Operation in a Structured Editing System", 1997.

Regarding Claim 1, Roisin discloses the claimed aspect of a method of information processing comprising: copying plural objects; selecting paste targets and pasting the plural objects to targets; wherein copying includes: analyzing a logical structure of a copy source information; recognizing an object that corresponds to a predetermined copy area of plural objects included in the copy source information; selecting the plural objects that belong to an upper object of the recognized object; extracting a partial copy source information corresponding to the selected plural objects;(Roisin, Abstract, Introduction, Page 85) performing a semantic analysis(Roisin, analysis of type elements of source and target, Introduction)on objects within the extracted partial copy source information; and specifying semantic attributes of the objects analyzed; wherein selecting paste targets includes; analyzing a logical structure of a paste target source information; recognizing an object corresponding to a user specified paste area selected from a plurality of objects within the paste target source information;

selecting a plurality of objects belonging to an upper object of the recognized extracting a partial paste target source information corresponding to the selected plurality of objects; performing a semantic analysis on objects partial paste included in the extracted target source information(Roisin, analysis of type elements of source and target, Introduction); and specifying semantic attributes of the analyzed objects included in the extracted partial paste target source information; and wherein pasting includes: selecting objects from the extracted partial paste target source information having the same semantic attributes as the objects analyzed in the partial copy source information. (Roisin, Abstract, Introduction, Section 2, structural components of a document, constructor, Section 3).

Regarding Claim 3, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 1. See the rejection of Claim 1 for details. Roisin discloses the claimed aspect of copying includes issuing the copy instruction by one user operation, and the selecting paste targets includes issuing the paste instruction by one user operation, wherein copy and paste operations are performed with one user operation. (Roisin, Section, cut-and-paste operation).

Regarding Claim 4, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 1. See the rejection of Claim 1 for details. Roisin discloses the claimed aspect of the selecting paste targets includes selecting the paste target based on

a result of analysis of a semantic distance between objects in the copy module and the paste module. (Roisin, FIG. 4, Section 3, Section 3.3. type comparison).

Regarding Claim 5, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 1. See the rejection of Claim 1 for details. Roisin discloses the claimed aspect of the copying includes copying plural objects with a structural association from the copy module based on the copy instruction, and the selecting paste targets includes selecting the paste target with a structural association from the paste module based on the paste instruction. (Roisin, Section 3, 3.2, 3.3).

Regarding Claim 6, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 1. See the rejection of Claim 1 for details. Roisin discloses the claimed aspect of the copying includes copying the plural objects(types of elements(objects)) in a predetermined range from the copy module based on the copy instruction, and the selecting includes selecting the paste target in a predetermined range from the paste module based on the paste instruction. (Roisin, Introduction, paste target is selected and types are compared, Section 3, FIG. 4).

Regarding Claims 12, 13, the rejection for Claim 1 applies to Claims 12, 13. See rejection details for Claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2 and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roisin and in further view of Rawat, US 6,662,340.

Regarding Claim 2, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 1. See the rejection of Claim 1. Roisin discloses the claimed aspect of the copying includes copying the plural objects from a copy module according to a copy instruction of a user, and the selecting paste targets includes selecting the

paste target from a paste module according to a paste instruction of the user.

(Roisin, Introduction, system cut-paste, type of elements, Section 3, type definition are checked, FIG.4).

Roisin discloses the claimed aspect of the use of a thesaurus dictionary database, wherein structure is confirmed to the type definition of the target document. (Roisin, Section 3).

Even if not Rawat discloses the concept of use of dictionary in FIG. 3 and FIG. 4, wherein the values are matched with the dictionaries previously described to map the fields to metadata, wherein metadata comprises a data type, such as Last name, First name, AddressLine 1, AddressLine 2 and City. (Rawat, Page 6, Paragraph 5, lines 3-9). Furthermore, Rawat discloses the claimed aspect of performing semantic analysis by analyzing text expressions that occur within a predetermined number of words and within predetermined direction and distances from the field and based on page coordinates, examining the general vicinity of the form in all directions from the field and analyzing the text expression closest to the field and ignoring supplemental text that does not contribute to the field label while searching for the field label, for example, text within parentheses or quotation marks. (Rawat, Page 6, Paragraph 45, lines 1-9). Applicant should duly note that of one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have other metadata classifications according to the setting and the functional requirements. Furthermore, Rawat discloses in FIG. 3 and FIG. 4 Label Dictionary, Normalization Dictionary and Display Dictionary.

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the dictionary concept(define rules database) to Roisin's cut-and-paste concept, because this would allow the user to set rules before any copy-and-paste operation.

Regarding Claim 14, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 13. See the rejection of Claim 13. The rejection for Claim 2 applies to Claim 14. See rejection details for Claim 2.

Regarding Claims 15-18, the rejection for Claims 1, 3-6 apply to Claims 15-18. See rejection details for Claims 1, 3-6.

Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roisin in further view of James, US 7,036,080 B1.

Regarding Claims 7 and 8, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 1. See the rejection of Claim 1 for details. Roisin does not teach the aspect of voice instruction. However, James discloses a method and apparatus for providing speech control to a graphical user interface (GUI), wherein audio input is used as instruction. (James, See Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Roisin's copy and paste features with James's voice instruction because, it will allow mobile users with inadequately-sized keyboards

and pointing devices to give voice instruction. Furthermore, typically, GUIs are mouse- and keyboard-intensive, which can be problematic or even impossible to use for many people, including those with physical disabilities. A speech interface allows audio input of commands to communicate with applications, and can be used by anyone who wishes to speak to their system. (James, Page 1, Paragraphs 15-20, lines 1-10).

Claims 19, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roisin in view of Rawat, 6,662,340 and in further view of James, US 7,036,080 B1.

Regarding Claims 19 and 20, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 14. See the rejection of Claim 14. The rejection for Claims 7 and 8 apply to Claims 19 and 20. See rejection details for Claims 7 and 8.

Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roisin, in further view of Bauchot, US 20020007380.

Regarding Claims 9 and 10, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 1. See the rejection of Claim 1 for details. Roisin does not teach the aspect of user acceptance. However, Bauchot discloses the claimed aspect of user acceptance in US 20020007380, in FIG. 7A, 703, wherein retrieving user's choice is illustrated.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Roisin's copy and paste features with Bauchot's user acceptance feature because, it will allow users to apply copy and paste function more efficiently. Applicant should duly note that user acceptance and user's choice is commonly applied in computer applications at the time of the invention.

Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roisin in view of Rawat, US 6,662,340 in further view of Bauchot, US 20020007380.

Regarding Claims 21 and 22, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 14. See the rejection of Claim 14. The rejection for Claims 9 and 10 apply to Claims 21 and 22. See rejection details for Claims 9 and 10.

Claims 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roisin and in further view of Terasawa, JP 05298003.

Regarding Claim 11, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 1. See the rejection of Claim 1 for details. Roisin does not specifically teach the claimed aspect of copy instruction and the paste instruction that are provided by an instruction device which has a communication function between the copy module and the paste module explicitly. However, Terasawa discloses the claimed aspect of copy instruction and the paste instruction are provided by

an instruction device which has a communication function between the copy module and the paste module in JP 405298003A, in 1993, a "Data processing device", which is a technique for having a plurality of paste buffers, in each of which data in the source screen data is stored. Terasawa discloses the claimed aspect of information processing comprising copying plural objects and pasting the plural objects to the paste targets and this allows users to avoid repeatedly switching between displaying the source screen and the editing target screen, and irrespective of the relation between the individual items in the plurality of data, the desired data is once copied to the plurality of paste buffers and then the destination of each buffer data is assigned one by one. (Hara, US 20070074133, Page 1, Paragraph 0003).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Roisin's copy and paste features with Terasawa's Data processing device because this will allow users to make copy multiple objects.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roisin in view of Rawat, US 6,662,340 and in further view of Terasawa, JP 05298003.

Regarding Claim 23, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 14. See the rejection of Claim 14. The rejection for Claim 11 applies to Claim 23. See rejection details for Claim 11.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roisin and in further view with Takatsuka, US 20020156615 A1.

Regarding Claim 24, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 1. See the rejection of Claim 1. Roisin does not teach the aspect of remote controller. However, Takatsuka discloses the claimed aspect of a remote controller which executes the method of information processing in FIG. 1, wherein a remote controller is displayed as an information entry device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Roisin's copy and paste features with Takatsuka's remote controller device because this will allow users rapid information entry.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

Art Unit: 2175

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ECE HUR whose telephone number is (571) 270-1972. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, WILLIAM BASHORE can be reached on 571-272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Art Unit: 2175

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

June 12, 2008

Ece Hur
E.H. /e.h.

/Kieu D Vu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2175